

*City of San Jose*

## ***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

**Summary of  
Task Force & Community Workshop Meeting #17  
on June 12, 2004  
San Jose McEnery Convention Center**

**Task Force Members Present:**

Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Supervisor Don Gage, Christopher Platten, Chuck Butters, Craig Edgerton, Eric Carruthers, Helen Chapman, Neil Struthers, and Steve Speno.

**Task Force Members Absent:**

Mayor Ron Gonzales (Co-Chair), Vice Mayor Pat Dando, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Ken Saso, Jim Cunneen, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Russ Danielson, Steve Schott, and Terry Watt.

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:**

Steve Kinsella (Gavilan College), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Kyle Simpson, (Greenbelt Alliance), Dunia Noel (LAFCO), Bill Smith (SCVWD), Sara Zimmerman (Working Partnerships), Porter Sexton (Santa Clara County Office of Education), and Beverly Bryant (HBANC).

**City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:**

Councilmember Linda LeZotte, Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Denelle Fedor (District 10), Emily Moody (District 2), Stephen Haase (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Bill Scott (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Melanie Richardson (SCVWD), Linda Skjei (ESD), and Fran McVey (ESD).

### **Consultants:**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Jim Musbach (Economic & Planning Systems), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Padru Kang (Dahlin Group), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Anu Natarajan (KenKay Associates), Cindy Wu (KenKay Associates), Jen Lau (KenKay Associates), Tiefion Rice-Evans (EPS), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Jim Thompson (HMH) and Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates), Mercedes Trujillo (Dahlin Group), Lauri Moffett-Fehlberg (Dahlin Group), Dave Rehfeld (Dahlin Group), Todd Lerner (Dahlin Group), Joe Atalla (Dahlin Group), Mario Aiello (Dahlin Group), Mark Retherford (Dahlin Group), Emily Bonato (Dahlin Group), Michael Suchocki (Dahlin Group), and Razvan Mosu (Dahlin Group).

### **Community Members Present:**

Joe Shyy, Beverly Stewart, Jo Crosby, Peter Constant, George Reilly, Crisand Giles, Art Gonzales, Richard Barberi, Barbara Woods, Rick Lindquist, Tony and Lily Dong, Eugene Bradley, CM Tomkinson, Janet Gutierrez, Lowell Tan, Bill and Iris Wise, Gerald Upshaw, Sarah Ruby, Frank Crane, M Crawford, Timm Steele, Lee Lester, Colin Tanner, Kerry Williams, Jean Gallup, Liz Hirata, Rosalie Cacitti, Yogesh Patel, Bob Wright, Rich and Linda Nedbal, Lil and Paul Ruscitto, Son Kuan, Daljit Dhallu, Mansour Derakhsh, Aeon Schmoock, Georgene Petri, Bob Levy, Stefanie Brand, Vera Brand, Jackie Moon, Angeles Steckles, Cecilie Schulze, Kerry Williams, Joe Mueller, Jean Marlowe, Russ Sataku, Tony Gianuzzi, Joan Doss, Brenda Holmes, Andrew Johnson, Charline Payne, Peter Benson, Glenn Yoshida, Don Weden, Rose Navarra, Pam Sharp, Cecilia Torres, Paul Herbert, Jim Goodell, Luis Freitas, Randy Single, Don Roen, Leonard Washington, Jim Zito, David Reid, Sean Morley, John Roeder, Virginia Holtz, Darlene Campbell, Kim McAfee, Suzanne Tobin, Roger Costa, Jeff Moore, Rodney Foo, Jim Arthur, Bob Andrews, Kate Hidalgo, Cindy McCormick, Byant Ackeson, Bob Butler, Ted Farrone, Michelle DeChine, Matt Kamkar, Francisco Guevara, Johnathan Chan, Sumiko Sorakubo, Pam Streller, Mark Sellheim, Brenda Rawson, Tim Foster, Kent Campbell, Jack and Pat Kuzia, David Godinec, Richard DeSmet, Sharon and Jon Hoeffling, Bill Foster, Laura Sellheim, Mike Carr, Rodger Griffin, and Yoon Lee.

## **1. Welcome:**

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. with co-chair Forrest Williams welcoming everyone in attendance at the community meeting.

## **2. Introductions and Agenda Overview:**

Eileen Goodwin, with APEX Strategies, began by stating that she recognized many people from the May 15<sup>th</sup> Community Workshop. With a show of hands, about three fourths of the audience had attended the previous community workshop. She also asked how people had heard of the meeting. A show of hands indicated that about one third had heard about it through the San Jose Mercury and the remainder had heard by direct mail, radio or another source. Eileen explained the agenda for the day and indicated that the land planning consultants would present the three alternative design concepts, after which people would attend three design studios in smaller groups with rotation based on color-coded nametags. She indicated that the three studios would include: the Design Studio, the Concept Studio, and the Vision Studio. Each person would have an opportunity to attend each of the three studios for about 40 minutes with a ½ hour lunch break. After the studio exercises the group would reconvene for reports from some of the studio group sessions.

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, used a PowerPoint presentation to review the City Council's Vision for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan, previous community workshops, the elements of a specific plan, and the process and major milestones in the development of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. She also explained the evaluation criteria that will be used to test the three alternatives over the summer.

## **3. Presentation of Three Alternative Design Concepts:**

Laurel introduced the land planning consultants, Doug Dahlin of Dahlin Group, and Ken Kay of KenKay Associates. Ken Kay summarized the findings of the baseline environmental analysis prepared by the Group I consultants and the highlights from the previous community workshops. By using cartoon graphics Ken illustrated a series of urban design strategies that will form the building blocks and the DNA of the three draft urban design concepts for the Coyote Valley.

Doug Dahlin presented three different variations for approaching the key "urban form" elements of the Plan. He highlighted the differences in the environmental footprint, transit system design, and the parkway system for the Plan. He explained each of the three alternative urban concepts for the Coyote Valley, which are nicknamed the "Spoke, Loop and Spine alternatives" based on the shapes of their transit systems. The components of the three alternative urban concepts include:

1) Alternative I - The Spoke Transit System:

- A large open green space as a focal point for the town center (at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Blvd.).
- A transit system in the shape of a “spoke” providing access to the town center and to outlying areas.
- Preservation of the Fisher Creek Corridor in its current alignment with some habitat enhancement and retention areas to the west adjacent to the foothills.
- A “merge and loop” parkway system extending into Coyote Valley from the two freeway interchanges on either side of the Highway 101/Bailey Interchange, providing access around the periphery of the Plan area.

2) Alternative II - The Loop Transit System:

- A lake as the focal point of the town center (at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Blvd.)
- A transit system in the shape of a loop around the town center providing access to the outlying areas.
- Restoration and enhancement of Fisher Creek and the addition of a second reach of Fisher Creek along the western hills of the mid-Coyote area.
- A peripheral “merge and loop” parkway system in a slightly different configuration than in Alternative No. 1.

3) Alternative III - The Spine Transit System:

- A large lake as the focal point of the town center.
- A transit system in the shape of a “spine”, extending north and south of the town center.
- Realignment of Fisher Creek corridor to its historic location along the base of the westerly foothills with additional water features, bio-filtration and recreation opportunities.
- A “merge and loop” parkway similar to Alt. No 1 and 2, with a section of parkway behind the IBM site.

Doug explained that in the Concept Studio people would have a chance to review each of the three alternative design concepts and provide their ideas for the Specific Plan. He indicated that in the Vision Studio people would select photos that represent their vision for three specific areas of the Plan (the town center, the urban neighborhoods and the Greenbelt). In the Design Studio people would have an opportunity to play “designer” by using blocks representing different building typologies to achieve 50,000 jobs and 25,000 housing units and design their concept for three areas of the plan (the town center, a transit-oriented neighborhood, and a transit-oriented workplace).

Eileen explained how the studio sessions would work and indicated that each person would have an opportunity to visit each studio for about 40 minutes. After lunch, everybody would reconvene for a report back on the studio exercises.

After the lunch break Eileen asked several people to provide a brief report about their studio exercises to the larger group and the following comments were made:

- 1) A representative of the Concept Studio stated that his group was impressed with the idea of the lake as the focal point of the town center, and that they wanted to have a natural landscape around the parkway. He indicated that, while they are not sure where development would be placed, the group supports a transit system and wants a centralized transit hub for CalTrain and light rail. He said that they also recommended the use of electric cars in connection with the transit stations. He reported that his group was concerned about development on the east side of the Monterey Road, adjacent to the Coyote Creek and in the area of the parkway, and wanted to be sure that there were adequate wildlife migration corridors are provided.
- 2) A representative from one of the Vision Studio groups recommended that the Greenbelt be renamed the "Greenbelt headache" because it is such a challenging design problem with all of its existing uses. Their wish list for the Greenbelt included: private estates, lots of sports facilities, a "real plan" for the Greenbelt to maximize the open space and the sense of community. They recommended that it be made part of the Urban Reserve.
- 3) A representative from one of the Design Studio groups liked the town center example of Reston, Virginia -- with a lake as the focal point and the high-rises around the lake. She also reported that they also had two specific recommendations: 1) locate lower density single family residences at the edge of the planning area rather than in the town center, and 2) create a prominent gateway to the town center with high-rises, and maintain the view of the lake from the Hwy 101. In addition, she said that they recommended local retail, recreation facilities (e.g. boat docks, ramps, boat rentals etc.) and a parking garage on the left side of the lake.

The group also recommend that parking be interspersed between all of the uses and that the views of the lake be preserved from many vantage points throughout the Coyote Valley area. They recommended that retail, office and housing be reasonably setback away from the lake to maximize the views of the lake. They also recommended a mixture of recreation uses such as tennis courts or volleyball on the roof of buildings.

Eileen complimented the consultant's digital team who displayed the actual photo on the screen of the block model created by Virginia's group as their vision for the core area around the lake.

- 4) A representative from one of the Concept Studio groups recommended that the core area

be designed in a manner similar to the design of the town around Lake Michigan in Chicago, which they thought was a charming design with a lot of mixed uses. In a recent visit to Chicago, She noted that the City had great charm, good “walk ability” and a lot of high-rise mixed uses. She noted, however that there was inadequate parking and she wanted to be sure that parking was addressed in the core plan. She indicated that that the lake would have a soothing and calming effect and create a great focal point.

The group recommended that transit be extended further to the south into Morgan Hill, Gilroy and San Benito County. In addition, they were concerned that Hwy 101 would have a lot of traffic congestion with only one freeway interchange and that there may be the need for more freeway interchanges to accommodate the traffic on Hwy 101.

- 5) A representative from one of the Design Studio groups had a difficult time coming to a consensus for the design of the core area. He said that his group had very different ideas: some wanted it to be a “very urban core” and others wanted the high-rises dispersed throughout the Plan area. They agreed on the use of residential clusters on the far right side with significant open space in the middle. They wanted to be sure that the roads disappeared in the middle so there would be a nice open feel to the core area.

Some group members wanted the gateway to the town center to be very dense and others said it should have a rural feel to it at first and then transition into the higher buildings slowly. The consensus for the gateway design was somewhere in the middle--- a gateway with retail and pedestrian orientation but that transitioned from lower buildings into the higher buildings slowly.

- 6) A representative from one of the Vision Studio groups had more photos that were de-selected than were selected. She indicated that there was some confusion as to what the overall goal was. She stated that gas stations and police substations were left out which indicated that they were not preferred.
- 7) A representative from one of the Concept Studio groups (also a member of the Public Transit Advocacy Watchdog Group) stated that his group felt that Alternative 2 did not serve all of the community so they revised the map to provide for transit closer to CalTrain. They recommended that the loop be bi-directional and that it be located as close as possible to the CalTrain Station (no more than 500 foot walking distance) to provide a central transit “hub”.
- 8) A representative from one of the Vision Studio groups stated that she felt the process was very interesting and provided something for everyone. The Vision Studio and photo preference exercise was for those who are visual, the Concept Studio and review of the three alternative design concepts was for those who wanted to conceptualize and the Design Studio and block design exercise was for those who wanted to be tactile. Overall, she thanked all of the consultants and staff and all of the community and said that it was

a very good workshop.

Laurel Prevettiti, Deputy Director of the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, explained the next steps in the planning process and reviewed the screening criteria that the three alternatives will be tested against over the summer. She also explained that staff and the consultants would be synthesizing the community's input for the Task Force Meeting on Monday, June 14, 2004. She encouraged everyone to attend the Task Force meeting at 5 p.m. at City Hall for the Task Force's review of the highlights of the workshop and the three alternative design concepts.

Laurel stated that the Task Force would decide whether the three concepts are heading in the right direction and provide any additional comments to the staff and consultants. She indicated that over the summer the consultants would be running these three alternatives through a variety of filters to see if they are feasible, whether the permitting agencies will support them, whether they are ecologically feasible and sustainable and whether they are cost effective. In addition, she indicated that they would be tested to see how the specific plan will start, how it will develop in phases over time and what the first catalyst projects would be. Laurel indicated that the alternatives would be tested for social equity and how the alternatives will work within the context of the City of San Jose and the whole region. She explained that the City will be doing a full EIR on the CVSP, with the project description and public scoping anticipated in late September or early October. Based on the evaluation over the summer, there will be a lot of data to help select a Preferred Design Concept at the next Community Workshop and Task Force meetings in August. at the next Community Workshop on Saturday, August 14<sup>th</sup>. Laurel asked the community if they had missed anything and whether they had any additional testing criteria that they would like to suggest.

#### Comments from the Community:

- Question is to how fixed the boundary between South and Mid- Coyote Valley is and whether the City Council would consider changing it.
- Recommendation that Ron Gonzalez and some of the other Task Force members attend these workshops.
- Question as to when the land that is now in the County will be annexed and will that involve working with LAFCO?
- Comment that many of the property owners in the Mid-Coyote and the Greenbelt areas are still in the County and were unable to vote on the establishment of the Greenline and Urban Growth Boundary, which they feel was unfair.
- Recommendation that the costs and the practicalities of the specific plan be studied carefully (particularly with regard to the lake).
- Question as to how will the costs versus the values will be balanced among the property owners.

- Question as to why the City has to plan for 50,000 jobs and 25,000 housing units and why this area requires such a high density.
- Comment that there may be the need for a 6-foot high fence around the lake because the lake will be for flood control and there will be a rise and fall at the edges of the lake that needs to be secure.
- Question as to whether the Plan will provide for a balance between the costs and benefits.
- Question as to how the costs of mitigation for the loss of agricultural lands and biotic impacts will be dealt with in the plan.
- Question as to whether traffic impacts will be considered in the filtering process over the summer.
- Question as to how the design concepts will impact existing property owners, what type of uses and what kind of buffer there will be.
- Question as to whether the filtering process will include the social concerns, maintenance of healthful activities and the maintenance of the sense of community that exists in Coyote.
- Comment that there are “haves and the have-nots” in this Specific Plan process (the “haves” are those owners in the North and the Mid- Coyote area and the “have-nots” are the Greenbelt owners).
- Recommendation that the City Council should initiate a specific plan for the Greenbelt area and get the property owners together to work on the plan.
- Comment that the scale of this Plan seems too large for this area and question as to how this Plan will be integrated into the rest of San Jose and into the whole region.
- Question as to how the jobs/housing balance be affected
- Comment that one half of the Task Force sits on the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors and they may be able to help get transit extended into the Coyote Valley.
- Comment that Bus Line #68 already serves the Coyote Valley and that there should be some discussions with VTA soon about the level of transit in the Coyote since they are experiencing some serious economic problems and will need to plan ahead for this.

#### **4. Adjourn:**

Co-chair Forrest Williams thanked the staff and the consultants and everyone in attendance for their comments and great participation in the workshop. He stated that he had talked to many people regarding whether the Palm Avenue boundary between the Urban Reserve and the Greenbelt should be moved. He encouraged people to put all of their ideas and concerns down in writing and indicated that the City Council would like to hear all of their ideas regarding this Plan.

He invited everyone to attend the Task Force meeting on Monday, June 14, 2004 and reminded everyone that the meeting would start a bit earlier, at 5:00 p.m. due to a scheduling conflict with



the City Council meeting on the budget on the same night.

The meeting was adjourned at about 2:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday June 14, 2004, at 151 West Mission Street, adjacent to City Hall.

\\Pbce005\CoyoteValley\_SpecificPlan\CVSP Mtgs\_TASKFORCE\Meeting Summary\TFNo. 20\Task  
Force\_Meeting#20\_6.12.04 Community Workshop.doc